

REMARKS

This Amendment is submitted in response to the Official Letter dated December 17, 2004, in which the Examiner rejected Claims 1, 7, 13-15 and 19. The Examiner also indicated that Claims 2-6, 8-12, 16-18, and 20 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate a limitation of Claim 2. None of the references disclose an object holder assembly having a plurality of panels that are movably mounted between a retracted position and an extended position, as Claim 1 now recites. Claims 2, 3, 9, 13 and 19 have been amended to put the Claims in proper form due to the amendment of Claim 1. Claims 17 and 20, indicated as being allowable by the Examiner, have also been amended to incorporate the limitations of the previously presented Claim 1 thereby placing them in independent form. The Examiner objected to the Specification due to the presence of informalities. The Specification has been amended to correct the informalities.

In view of the foregoing amendments, it is believed that the Application is in condition for Allowance. Accordingly, an early Notice thereof is respectfully requested. However, if the Examiner feels that he is unable to issue a Notice of Allowance for any reason, Applicants request that the Examiner contact Applicants' attorney, Shital A. Shah, at 419.255.5900 to discuss this case.